DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 783 HE 015 172

AUTHOR Kronk, Annie K.; Shipka, Thomas A.
TITLE Evaluation of Faculty in Higher Education: A Handbook for Faculty Leaders.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO NEA-1520-7-00
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; Due Process; *Employment Problems; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Peer Evaluation; Political Influences; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Standards; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Employment; Teacher Role; *Teacher Welfare

ABSTRACT

Aspects of faculty evaluation that directly affect employment decisions are considered to assist faculty members, and especially faculty leaders. Advantages and disadvantages of the following five methods of evaluating faculty are examined: self-evaluation, student rating, administrator observation and visitation, colleague review, and evidence of student learning. It is suggested that (1) a combination of methods provides a check-and-balance system, and (2) as faculty members participate in developing an institutional evaluation system, they should aim at a balance between the institution's need for competent and productive faculty and the reasonable demands of faculty for job security and due process. Thirteen standards to ensure fair treatment or due process that may be established through collective bargaining or other mechanisms include: an individual should receive specific, valid reasons for an adverse decision; the individual should receive prompt notice if an evaluator views his performance as deficient in some respect; and the individual should be given a reasonable length of time to correct noted deficiencies prior to the adverse decision. It is suggested that there is a need for an evaluation system to reflect the nature of the institution (e.g., 2-year and 4-year) and the actual work of each individual evaluated. Activities pertaining to teaching, scholarship, and service are outlined. Some evaluation approaches permit the faculty member to select the weights to be given to various general duties. Political aspects of evaluation design, development, and implementation are addressed, and descriptive summaries of common evaluation methods and an annotated bibliography are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217783

Evaluation of Faculty in Higher Education

A Handbook for Faculty Leaders

Annie K. Kronk
Thomas A. Shipka

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE015172

nea
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 1980
National Education Association of the United States

EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
A Handbook for Faculty Leaders

Erratum

Contrary to what is stated in Item 2 on page 7, California has not formally abolished its tuition-free system of higher education, either in junior colleges or in the state university and colleges.

CONTENTS

Background 7

Methods of Evaluation 9

Evaluation and Faculty Security 12

Diversity of Faculty Roles 14

Uses of Evaluation Results 17

The Politics of Evaluation 18

Footnotes 20

Appendices 21

Appendix A: Summary of Evaluation Methods in Use 23

Appendix B: Bibliography 29

NEA HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL, 1980-1981

John A. Thompson, Chairperson
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

John H. Bracey, Jr.
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

William Crist
California State College
Turlock, California

David Dierking
Alpena Community College
Alpena, Michigan

James Durham
Minnesota Community College Faculty Association
St. Paul, Minnesota

Elias Y. Esquer
Mesa Community College
Mesa, Arizona

Lloyd Evans
Pikes Peak Community College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Kathy R. Jones
Roane State Community College
Harriman, Tennessee

Anthony R. Leone
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

Howard Parish
Jersey City State College
Jersey City, New Jersey

L. Alice Peters
Bergen Community College
Paramus, New Jersey

Robert Rose
Western Nevada Community College
Sparks, Nevada

John Turner
Cabrillo College
Aptos, California

Joyce Zinchini
Mansfield State College
Mansfield, Pennsylvania

The Authors

Annie K. Kronk is Executive Assistant to the President, Hood College, Frederick, Maryland.

Thomas A. Shipka is Professor of Philosophy, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio.

The Consultants

The following persons contributed to the development of the handbook: John Leeke, Richard Mallory, and Robert Miner, NEA Staff; George Shaw, Teacher, Yuba College, Marysville, California; and John Thompson, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

BACKGROUND

Throughout the nation today a lot of attention is focused on the evaluation of the work of teachers at all levels, in elementary and secondary schools as well as colleges and universities. Many observers perceive this attention as part of the so-called accountability movement in education which emerged in the late 1960's, survived the 1970's, and shows no signs of disappearing in the 1980's.

The concern over evaluation of faculty in higher education has been fueled by a variety of factors, including the following:

1. In enforcing laws against discrimination related to sex, age, race, religion, or national origin, the courts and government agencies are encouraging techniques to measure job performance more objectively. Administrators often view this as a mandate for formal, periodic, uniform evaluation of academic employees, both professional and nonprofessional.
2. With the abolition of tuition-free higher education in New York and California, and the steady rise in the cost of higher education across the nation, students in the traditional college age group and their parents are insisting on competent instruction for their investment.
3. Precipitated by the actual and predicted decline in enrollments, initiatives to attract nontraditional students bring to the classroom older students with high expectations and with strong feelings about the quality of their instructors.
4. Many administrators believe that present and future economic realities call for very selective tenuring or portend staff cutbacks. This group is anxious to secure information on faculty performance which is more thorough and systematic than they have sought in the past in order to make intelligent and responsible personnel decisions in difficult times at their institutions.
5. The lack of mobility in the academic market today for most college teachers has encouraged stiffer competition for scarce rewards such as tenure, promotion, and sabbaticals as well as a readiness to appeal adverse decisions to on-campus or off-campus sources. Since frequently this means that institutional representatives are required to explain or justify a personnel decision, there is a need for systematically gathered information to legitimate that decision in the context of an appeal.

The surge of interest in evaluation of college faculty does not mark the first time evaluation has taken place on campuses. *Evaluation is appraising the quality, worth, or effectiveness of an individual's work.* This is done inescapably by students, colleagues, and administrators who develop opinions about a specific teacher. These opinions may

arise from hearsay or from direct, personal experience; from an informal and haphazard process or from a formal and systematic one. *The issue is not whether faculty will be evaluated but whether they will be evaluated sensibly and responsibly.* Thus, what we are seeing today is not evaluation for the first time but more formal methods of evaluation than have been customary in higher education.

Evaluation may have two basic purposes: either it is a means to *improve a faculty member's effectiveness* in performing his or her duties, or it is a means to generate information about that performance as a *basis for an employment decision.* Evaluation experts sometimes refer to the first type as "formative" and the second as "summative." It is possible to pursue both performance improvement and data for decision making in a single evaluation, although many observers are skeptical about the extent to which both can be achieved simultaneously.

Further, one can distinguish between *voluntary evaluation* and *compulsory evaluation.* The former is an endangered species, especially for nontenured faculty, and is most often tied to evaluation for the purpose of enhancing effectiveness. Compulsory evaluation is the type which institutions impose on all or nearly all faculty on a regular basis as a condition of employment and as a means of gathering information for personnel decisions.

The focus of this document is evaluation aimed at gathering data for employment decisions. This is not because the authors are not in favor of improving teaching. Rather, it follows from the simple observation that *one can become a better teacher only if one holds a teaching position.* Thus, we choose to concentrate on that aspect of evaluation which directly affects jobs and income.

Many faculty view evaluation like a cold. They see it as a minor discomfort which they hope will disappear soon and stay away. This is wishful thinking. Faculty evaluation is here to stay for the foreseeable future. It is very important, therefore, that faculty members, wherever they work, take a direct interest in evaluation at their institutions. In principle, evaluation is neutral, neither good nor evil. With the proper care and attention from faculty, evaluation can promote reasonable job security and make decision making more sensible. With neglect or apathy from faculty, it can harm them and their institutions. The unconcerned faculty member is inviting administrators, acting alone or with colleagues and students, to put flawed evaluation instruments in practice and to use their results in a reckless fashion.

This handbook is intended as a source of advice to faculty, and especially faculty leaders, whether they are engaged in collective bargaining or not, as they wrestle with the enormously complex and controversial issue of faculty evaluation on their campuses. It is not *the* definitive statement on evaluation, but the authors feel that it can help the reader to appreciate the many facets of the issue and to avoid some of the errors made on some campuses in the past.

METHODS OF EVALUATION

A perennial issue in assessing faculty performance is who evaluates and by what method. The methods currently used include those described below.

1. Self-evaluation

Many institutions, especially community colleges, use self-evaluation as a basic component of the faculty assessment program. An advantage of self-evaluation is that it permits faculty members to describe their accomplishments and difficulties in their own terms and to identify areas in which they need improvement and additional resources.

Self-evaluation can be a helpful tool for self-improvement, but its objective value is questionable. Centra's[1] studies showed little agreement between faculty self-reports on teaching effectiveness and effectiveness ratings by students, administrators, and colleagues. Faculty appear to see themselves as generally more effective than they are, especially in student-instructor interaction.

Another disadvantage is the inherent potential for self-incrimination. An honest and specific self-evaluation which falls into the hands of administrators or other decision-makers may be used to support adverse decisions such as nonrenewal, promotion denial, or tenure denial. Further, a self-evaluation is extremely difficult to quantify, which therefore restricts its comparative uses.

2. Student Rating

Student rating is probably the most widely used structured method of evaluating faculty in higher education.[2] This method reflects the level of student satisfaction with a teacher's performance in the classroom.

It seems appropriate to seek out student appraisal of instruction since students are the only ones who observe teaching for the entire course. However, many administrators and faculty claim that students are not necessarily satisfied with effective instruction or dissatisfied with ineffective instruction. Also, few in this group of skeptics would trust students to evaluate professional competence, primarily due to their limited grasp of the subject matter.

Some critics of this method point out the students' vulnerability to "Dr. Fox," the superficial but spellbinding teacher, or their supposed reliance on a professor's grading standards as a key factor in their assessment. Further, nearly all educators would agree

that student opinion is often affected by variables beyond the faculty member's control, such as class size and course content, which should be taken into account when interpreting student reports.

Despite such reservations, nearly half the higher education institutions in the nation continue to use student rating.[3]

3. Administrator Observation and Visitation

Administrators who evaluate faculty performance sometimes visit the instructional setting for firsthand experience. In some instances this is done several times over an evaluation period; in others it is less frequent. In some institutions the administrator grades the faculty member on a scale and computes a total as an indicator of his or her effectiveness as a teacher. In others the administrator prepares a narrative, nonquantified assessment. Classroom visitation by administrators is practiced much more widely in two-year colleges than four-year or graduate institutions.

In most cases an administrator is the decision maker of record, and so this method seems logical. On the other hand, occasional classroom observations seem to be an insufficient basis for a reliable and accurate appraisal of a faculty member's overall and continuing performance. Also, except in those cases where an administrator is trained in the academic field of the instructor, it is virtually impossible for the evaluator to assess the instructor's professional competence. Finally, if the administrator fails to keep notes of classroom observations, or to share his or her evaluation with the faculty member, then the faculty member is placed at a distinct disadvantage in responding to the evaluation.

More on this aspect of evaluation is included in the section on faculty security (see p. 12).

4. Colleague Review

Colleagues are placed in the role of evaluator at many institutions, especially, but not exclusively, at four-year colleges and universities. Evaluation by colleagues may take place in connection with employment decisions (e.g., promotion) or as part of a periodic process (annual, biennial, triennial, etc.). This method usually involves a committee, some of whom may be chosen by the faculty member and some of whom may be from outside the individual's department, college, or institution. At two-year institutions the focus of colleague review is typically teaching and institutional or public service. In other institutions it includes scholarly production. In most cases the committee shares its assessment with the faculty member. In some instances, however, the evaluation is considered confidential and goes directly to an appropriate administrator as background for his or her formative or summative evaluation of the individual.

In most cases colleagues are better equipped than administrators or students to judge a faculty member's scholarly attainments and perhaps other aspects of his or her work. Critics of peer review, however, charge that the process is fraught with politics and personalities and that genuine academic judgments are the exception rather than the rule. Many colleague evaluators prefer closed-door reviews which protect their anonymity as evaluators. While this may be more pleasant for all concerned, it may also work to the evaluatee's detriment since he or she is kept in the dark at a critical moment and perhaps denied the opportunity to correct mistaken perceptions or to respond to damaging conclusions. Further, colleagues usually balk at ranking several individuals under evaluation, even when ranking would be useful, as in applications for promotion.

5. Student Learning

Many colleges and universities rely on evidence of student learning in a course as a measure of teaching effectiveness. This is particularly true at institutions which employ management by objectives, competency-based curricula, or so-called systems approaches to instruction. Several writers, including Meeth,[4] suggest that *what a student learns* can be determined through pretesting and posttesting, that this factor more than any other identifies a teacher's effectiveness and should, therefore, constitute the prime evidence for job-related decisions.

This method of evaluation is not popular among teachers at any level of education. Critics point out that many factors in learning are out of the instructor's control, such as motivation, family influences, native ability, a student's overall course load, acquired study habits, class size, and course content.[5] They feel, therefore, that such evaluations are inherently unfair to the instructor.

Each of the five evaluation methods outlined abov has advantages and disadvantages, strengths and weaknesses, supporters and detractors. It is prudent, therefore, to use a combination of methods instead of any particular one. A combination provides a sort of check-and-balance system, to the extent that is possible.

As faculty members participate in developing an institutional evaluation system, they should aim at a balance between the *institution's need for competent and productive faculty* on the one hand and the *reasonable demands of faculty for job security and due process* on the other. They should also make sure that the evaluation system reflects the *nature of the institution* (two-year, four-year, graduate, etc.) and the *actual work* of each individual evaluated. These matters will be discussed more fully in the following sections.

EVALUATION AND FACULTY SECURITY

Faculty leaders have two tasks, not one, when they take up the issue of faculty evaluation. The first deals with developing a sound evaluation system which meshes with both the nature of the institution and the nature of the work performed. The second deals with providing *fair treatment* or *due process* to those evaluated.[6] This means that reasonable safeguards are necessary to protect the legitimate rights and interests of faculty members. In the absence of such safeguards, faculty evaluation merely adds to the hazards of employment in higher education today.

Fair treatment or due process requires that the following safeguards be established through collective bargaining or other institutional mechanisms:

1. An individual should receive specific, valid reasons for an adverse decision.
2. These reasons should be based on a fair and open appraisal of the individual's work.
3. The individual should receive prompt notice if an evaluator views his or her performance as deficient in some respect.
4. The individual should be given a reasonable length of time to correct noted deficiencies prior to the adverse decision.
5. The institution should provide a program to improve faculty performance for individuals who choose to take advantage of it on a *voluntary* basis.
6. The individual should have access to all evaluations of his or her work.
7. The individual should have the opportunity to respond to an evaluation in writing in respect to its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. The individual's response should then become part of the evaluation.
8. The individual should have the opportunity to purge any institutional file of prior evaluations after a specified time, and when allegations in any evaluation are clearly inaccurate, irrelevant, or incomplete.
9. If an evaluation results in an adverse personnel decision, such as nonrenewal, tenure denial, or promotion denial, the individual should have the right to appeal the decision to a fair and impartial source.
10. In such an appeal the individual should have the right to representation.
11. The standards of performance expected of a faculty member should be made clear to him or her at the time of appointment and remain in effect unless the individual and an appropriate administrator later agree on changed standards.
12. The faculty member should be evaluated in accord with the established standards of performance and the actual work assigned to him or her.

13. The faculty member should be evaluated in the same fashion as other faculty members who do the same kind of work.

The upsurge of collective bargaining in higher education in the past decade shows in part that many faculties feel insecure and vulnerable because their institutions lack some of these safeguards.[7] *On campuses with collective bargaining, it is the obligation of the recognized bargaining agent to monitor the evaluation system to assure that it preserves the legitimate rights and interests of the faculty.* On campuses without collective bargaining, faculty must turn to other means for self-protection, but few, if any, will prove to be as effective as a faculty union which negotiates and enforces master contracts skillfully.

DIVERSITY OF FACULTY ROLES

There are many, many differences among the more than two thousand institutions of higher education in the United States. Some emphasize vocational education, others liberal education, others religiously grounded education, others research or advanced education, and others a combination. Some are publicly subsidized, others are not.

These and other institutional differences are largely responsible for the varying roles which faculty perform from campus to campus. In two-year colleges, teaching is usually the main emphasis. In four-year and graduate institutions research and publication assume more importance. Further, *even on a particular campus faculty tasks are diverse.* As part of their respective workloads, one individual may be assigned to advise the student newspaper, another to supervise laboratories, and another to develop a new course, while all the time each has a teaching assignment too.

The reason for emphasizing the differences among colleges and the diversity in assignments is to point up the need for a *clear understanding shared by evaluator and faculty member of the latter's actual assignment.* It is vital that a list of an individual's specific duties be agreed to by him or her and the appropriate administrator. When such duties are reduced to writing they may be called a *job description,* a term rarely used in college circles. Rare though it may be, a job description is not merely a convenient way to spell out the duties associated with a position; an intelligent evaluation is practically impossible without one. *Unless the activity to be evaluated is known, how can that activity be evaluated?*

These comments are intended to address the problem of *weighting* as well. For instance, if a professor has been granted a sabbatical to write a study on Shakespeare, that project should be the exclusive basis of his or her evaluation for the period of leave. No weight in that period should be given to other factors such as teaching or committee service. Likewise, an individual with a heavy teaching load should be judged more on the quality of his or her instruction than on factors such as scholarly production during the period at hand.

Some evaluation approaches permit the faculty member to select the weights to be given to various general duties. For instance, teaching may count for 50 percent, scholarly production for 25 percent, and service (institutional, public, or professional association) 25 percent. Usually, such a plan establishes minima and maxima which cannot be violated.

To show the multitude of duties which a faculty member may be asked to perform, we furnish the following lists under the commonly used categories of "teaching," "scholarship," and "service."[8]

Teaching may include the following activities:

1. Classroom instruction, preparation, and supervision
2. Field-based or off-campus instruction
3. Laboratory design, preparation, instruction, supervision, and other associated responsibilities
4. Student teacher supervision and evaluation
5. Measurement of student performance, including the preparation, administration, grading and evaluation of tests, papers, and examinations, and the reporting of grades
6. Conferences with and academic advisement of students outside of their registration needs
7. Coordination, supervision, and evaluation of student research beyond regular course assignments, including research for a graduate degree
8. Coordination and supervision of student activities directly related to the academic program, such as directing the debate team or supervising the intramural athletic program
9. Coordination and supervision of academic programs such as Classical Studies, Engineering Technology, and English Composition
10. Experiments in teaching methods and teaching-oriented research
11. Writing letters of recommendation for students
12. Selection and procurement of books, films, and other materials for classroom or laboratory use
13. Evaluation periodically of library holdings and recommendation of books to be ordered by the library
14. Development of new courses and programs of study
15. Service as a member of a graduate student's research project committee.

Scholarship may include the following activities:

1. Research which leads to the discovery of new knowledge or new applications of existing knowledge
2. Research intended to lead to publication in scholarly journals or books
3. Ongoing reading and research to maintain proficiency and growth in one's field of professional specialization
4. In the case of fine and performing arts, regular practice and performance to maintain and develop professional skills

5. Research intended to lead to the preparation and presentation of a scholarly paper to a professional society, or a paper in one's field of specialization to any group
6. Editing professional journals and serving as a referee of manuscripts that have been submitted to a journal
7. Reviewing texts in one's field of specialization for publishers
8. Holding membership or an office in professional associations
9. Attending and participating in meetings, conferences, and conventions of professional associations
10. Writing proposals for financial support of research or other projects, including academic institutes or workshops
11. Consulting with the faculty on research proposals or projects
12. University-connected consultation or discipline-connected community service.

Service may include the following activities:

1. Service on department, college, and university committees
2. Service on faculty association committees
3. Service on the academic senate and its committees
4. Service on university-related committees such as the credit union
5. Participation in university-sponsored activities to recruit students
6. Interviewing and screening candidates for faculty and staff appointments
7. Coordination, advisement, and supervision of student organizations or student activities not directly related to the academic program
8. Advisement and counseling of students during registration periods
9. Participation in university-sponsored community service or community projects
10. Taking inventory of equipment and supplies
11. Service as the designated representative of the university
12. Participation in community-sponsored activities within the university, such as the United Way drive.

With these lists in mind, it is apparent that a vague reference to "duties as assigned" or to "teaching and other appropriate duties" falls short of a reasonable job description. While all parties may wish to avoid a long list of specifics, certainly some are necessary. It is by selecting items similar to those on the previous lists that one formulates a job

description and thereby sets the scope of the faculty member's assignment. *The tasks so selected should be the exclusive focus of the evaluator when the evaluation takes place.*

The administrator and the faculty member should attempt to agree on this delineation of tasks at the very beginning of the period to be evaluated. There should be no subsequent change in the absence of mutual agreement. On most campuses the administrator will claim to have the final authority if he or she and the faculty member fail to reach agreement on an assignment. But institutional policies which are negotiated or adopted through other channels can serve to moderate the discretion of the administrator to assure both that the workload is reasonable and that the assignment is one befitting a college-level teacher and scholar.

USES OF EVALUATION RESULTS

Upon completion of an evaluation, the evaluation form or report should be sent to the faculty member for his or her review and opportunity to attach written comments for the purposes of clarification, elaboration, or criticism. The faculty member's attached comments should accompany each copy of the evaluation and be considered an integral part of the evaluation document.

Copies of the evaluation document may also go to appropriate administrators and into the official personnel file, but unless the faculty member has given written permission, copies should not be circulated to colleagues, students, or the public.

If the evaluation is placed in any institutional personnel file, the faculty member should have access to that file. Further, a negotiated labor agreement or institutional policy should stipulate that the faculty member may effectively challenge the inclusion in the file of inaccurate, irrelevant, or incomplete evaluation information and that he or she may remove a previous evaluation after the passage of a set period of time.

THE POLITICS OF EVALUATION

When various segments of the campus community take up the study and discussion of a proposed faculty evaluation system, a faculty leader may find himself or herself saddled with the proverbial can of worms. Faculty evaluation is simply too complex and controversial a subject to lend itself to early or easy consensus. Even after months of development, trial runs, compromises, and changes there will be humanists who label the plan "too mechanical," statisticians who find it "too subjective," and students who perceive it as "irrelevant" to their concerns. This is likely to be true whether the evaluation system is purchased in its entirety, locally developed in its entirety, or a combination of external and internal components.

The development and implementation of a faculty evaluation system will test the skills of even the most politically sophisticated faculty leaders. They should exercise caution and restraint, always with a view to putting an instrument into use within a reasonable time, whether it was developed locally or purchased from an outside source.

The wise faculty leader must avoid many pitfalls. The following are especially dangerous:

1. *Purists* will insist that faculty performance is measurable with microscopic precision. They will sanctify mathematical formulae and quantification schemes and explain confidently how 150 faculty can be ranked in order of the quality of their respective performances. Such claims are not only doubtful, but they can terrify the bulk of the moderates on campus and turn them sour on all evaluation discussion. Beware of the purists.
2. *Utopians* will hold out hope for the perfect evaluation system. They will reject every revised instrument as partly defective and therefore worthless. While this may be well-intentioned, it will devastate the attempt to put an instrument into use. Beware of the utopians.
3. *Saboteurs* will claim to support evaluation in principle but will find major flaws in every instrument or set of procedures which is proposed. They will camouflage their destructive intentions under the pretense of constructive criticism and call for endless "testing" and "refinement." Beware of saboteurs.
4. *Naive* faculty will be all too ready to leap into a novel system of evaluation before they have analyzed its makeup and its implications for faculty security. There are even a handful on most campuses who salivate at the prospect of dismantling tenure, an institution they disdain. Willingness to change is welcome; precipitous and reckless action is not. Beware of the naive.

5. *Reactionaries* will proclaim that any kind of systematic evaluation necessarily undermines tenure. They will oppose evaluation in principle and align themselves with any of the above groups when such ties seem to serve their objective: the avoidance of systematic evaluation altogether. They overlook the protections afforded in due process policies and they ignore the fact that systematic evaluation may be relevant to a variety of employment decisions on tenured faculty (e.g., merit pay, promotion, research grants, sabbaticals, teaching or scholarship awards). Beware of the reactionaries.

Two additional points need to be raised in respect to the political aspects of evaluation design, development, and implementation.

Sooner or later a faculty leader will hear the refrain that faculty evaluation is welcome provided it is voluntary. In regard to evaluation for enhancing professional skills, voluntary evaluation is a perfectly sensible notion. In respect to evaluation for personnel decision making, however, it is not. *If the latter type of evaluation were voluntary, the volunteers would eventually include primarily those whose evaluations are complimentary.* This destroys the possibility of comparing the performance of faculty who compete for scarce rewards. Also, on the one hand, it relieves nonvolunteers of the burden to demonstrate their effectiveness; on the other, it opens the door to administrative decision making which need not reflect systematically gathered data on faculty performance. Thus, voluntary evaluation sounds like a panacea, but it is not.

The best approach is to require evaluation of all faculty on a scheduled basis, with the option of more frequent evaluation for those who desire it. In this connection, the frequency of evaluation for tenured faculty need not be the same as that for nontenured faculty on campuses where that distinction obtains.

Finally, faculty leaders may be surprised to discover that *some administrators balk at the idea of systematic evaluation of faculty.* This may occur either before or after a system is in effect. This reticence has three possible causes. In the first case the administrator may have genuine reservations as to what form the evaluation should take. In the second case he or she may worry over the cost of evaluation, particularly when computer and staff time are counted. In the third case the individual may sense that evaluation restricts "managerial prerogatives."

The third case is likely to occur when evaluation occurs in the context of due process. Some administrators would prefer not to have a faculty member's "track record" on file at decision-making time. It is difficult to deny tenure or promotion to an individual with a strong evaluation record. Evaluation may deter an administrator from a course of action which he or she cannot possibly justify in an appeal.

As a result, faculty leaders should be wary of attempts to stop the implementation of an evaluation system, particularly when such attempts enjoy covert or overt administrative support. The motives behind the action may be less than praiseworthy.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Centra, John A., editor. *Renewing and Evaluating Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

[2]"Faculty Evaluation in Higher Education." *Research Memo.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1978.

[3]In 1977 more than two hundred campuses in the United States and Canada used the "Student Instructional Report" provided by the Educational Testing Service. Nearly fifty others used the "cafeteria" format of Purdue's Measurement and Research Center. Hundreds more used other purchased or locally developed questionnaires.

[4]Meeth, L. Richard. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation." *Report on Teaching.* Vol. 2. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1976.

[5]For a critique of achievement-based evaluation of faculty performance, see Soar, R.S., and Soar, R.M. "Problems in Using Pupil Outcomes for Teacher Evaluation." *Standardized Testing Issues: Teachers' Perspectives.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1977. pp. 52-57.

[6]For additional information on due process, see "Statement on Due Process and Tenure." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, n.d.

[7]A recent survey shows that most faculty (69.1%) believe that due process procedures at their institutions need improving. See "Higher Education Faculty: Characteristics and Opinions." *Research Memo.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1979.

[8]This list is taken largely from the collective bargaining contract in effect at Youngstown State University in Youngstown, Ohio.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODS IN USE

To supplement the material in the text, here are descriptive summaries of evaluation methods in use at many colleges and universities. Most institutions use a combination of these procedures to comprise their total evaluation program. This information is intended to illustrate further what is actually done, not necessarily what the authors consider preferable. For instance, the authors would have misgivings about self-evaluation (No. 1 below), the secret committee (No. 4), and the prospect of a closed personnel file in administrator evaluation (No. 5) because of the hazards they entail. (See the section on faculty security, p. 12.)

Notice that No. 6 below deals not merely with personnel decisions on faculty but with a wide range of institutional decisions affecting policies, programs, and personnel.

1. Self-Report

1.1 *Product*: A written summary report by the faculty member being evaluated.

1.2 *Process*: The institution develops a form for self-evaluation, which is made available to the faculty member at the beginning of each academic year. All pertinent information is assembled, organized, and submitted to an administrator, who retains the report, may discuss it with the faculty member, and uses it according to the evaluation program in effect to make recommendations for improvement or to make employment-related decisions.

2. Student Evaluation

2.1 *Product*: A rating form completed for each course by the students in the course; objectively scored, medians and means established. If the forms are part of a purchased system, they provide national norms and data for comparative uses.

2.2 *Process*: The institution develops or purchases a system which can be quantitatively rated and completed quickly and easily by students, who

may remain anonymous. Forms are processed by the evaluation division, the department, or the faculty member; comparisons across departments, divisions, and the institution are possible. Final use at the institution varies according to the evaluation program. For example, faculty members may retain student evaluations and use them as evidence in support of their employment situation, or administrators may use the results as part of a larger evidential package which is a basis for recommendations regarding renewal, tenure, promotion, etc.

2.3 *Sample Systems*:

2.31 *Cafeteria System*: Consists of a standard list of 197 questions, plus 3 additional questions formulated by the instructor and a core of 5 college-wide questions designed to measure general aspects of teaching. The faculty user selects 40 items plus the 5 core items. Students complete the questionnaire, the forms are processed, and ratings are compiled.

Developed by the Purdue University Measurement and Research Center.

2.32 *Student Instructional Report*: Consists of a standard 49-item questionnaire, with a fiftieth item for written comments. Forms are numerically rated, objectively scored.

Developed and marketed by the Educational Testing Service.

3. Contract Plan

3.1 *Product: A* written outcomes assessment based on a "growth contract," prepared by the faculty member in consultation with an evaluation committee.

3.2 *Process*: The institution develops a statement on the roles and responsibilities of faculty members. Within its context, the faculty member, in consultation with a self-selected evaluation committee, prepares a written "contract" or plan which includes assessment of strengths and weaknesses; areas of contribution and how each will be evaluated; goals and objectives for growth and improvement, including means of evaluation; resources necessary to implement the plan; and who will serve as members of the evaluation committee. Periodically, the faculty member meets with the evaluation committee. At the end of the "contract"

period, the committee and faculty member prepare a written outcomes assessment. The summary is passed on to the administrator(s) and/or retained by the faculty member, according to the evaluation program in effect.

4. Secret Committee

4.1 *Product*: Several independently prepared written judgments about the faculty member, which are pooled and used by the administrator(s).

4.2 *Process*: A faculty member candidate for promotion or tenure nominates five or six peers to serve as evaluators. The names are forwarded to the dean, who selects three or four and adds three others (usually tenured faculty, two of whom may be from outside the department but in a related field). These form an evaluation committee which never meets and remains (on the academic integrity of each) anonymous to the faculty member under review and all others except the dean who appoints them. Materials provided by the faculty member being evaluated are given by the dean to each member of the committee. Each committee member arrives at an independent general judgment about the candidate, signs a written copy of that assessment, and submits it to the dean. The dean then pools the evaluations on each characteristic and makes a determination on the basis of the advice provided.

5. Administrator Evaluation

5.1 *Product*: A file of materials collected annually, summarized as evidence at the time of administrative decision making.

5.2 *Process*: The administrator keeps an evaluation file, which is updated with memoranda, information, notes on activities and classroom visitations, etc. Data regarding the quality of each faculty member's job performance are provided by the immediate administrator, the dean, and others. Each file is reviewed annually; information pertinent to job-related decisions is compiled and retained by the administrator until he/she is called upon to make a recommendation regarding renewal, promotion, tenure, or dismissal. Files may be closed or open to faculty members, depending upon state statutes and/or institutional policy.

6. Statistical Evidence

6.1 *Product*: Information which is systematically gathered, organized, and presented in quantifiable format on which project, program, or systems decisions affecting faculty are made.

6.2 *Process*: The institution selects or designs a model that meets its particular requirements for educational decision making. The decision-making system in place at the institution is analyzed to determine the various kinds of decisions which must be made and by whom. Information needed to make those decisions is gathered through a systematic plan for selection, collection, and analysis, with evaluation at each step in the process. Finally, this information is reported to the appropriate decision maker(s).

6.3 *Models*:

6.31 *CIPP Model*: Originated by Daniel Stufflebeam and Evelyn Guba, CIPP (pronounced "sip") is an abbreviation for the four types of evaluation it identifies: context, input, process, and product.

6.32 *CSE Model*: This approach was developed at the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE). It is extremely attentive to the specific requirements of those in positions to make educational decisions. Although similar to CIPP, the CSE model reconceptualizes process evaluation in order to encourage evaluators to examine the product as well as the process of the program being evaluated.

6.33 *Discrepancy Model*: This is another systematic approach to evaluation. It was developed by Malcolm Provus while he was director of research for the Pittsburgh (Pa.) school system. The Discrepancy Model compares actual performance with standards for performance and uses discrepancy information to change either the performance or the standards, or both.

6.4 *Sample Systems*:

6.41 National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) Faculty Activity and Outcome Survey.

6.42 Higher Education Planning System (HEPS), marketed by Education and Economic Systems, Inc.

6.43 WICHE/NCHEMS Costing and Data Management System.

Note: Readers who wish to obtain additional materials, such as copies of negotiated contracts with evaluation provisions or samples of evaluation instruments, should send a request in writing to:

National Education Association
Instruction and Professional Development
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

27

Appendix B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The literature on teacher evaluation is voluminous. As an aid to those who wish to read on the topic for the first time in depth, here is a selected bibliography which the authors consider both basic and informative. Many of the books listed contain extensive bibliographies which may guide further reading and research.

Alkin, Marvin C. "Evaluation Theory Development." *Evaluation Comment*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1969; also, "An Introduction to the Center." Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, January 1974. Description of the Center's approach to evaluation and the CSE model, by the director of the Center.

Bergman, Jerry. "The Effectiveness of Peer Ratings at the University Level." *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 46, Fall 1979. (In press.) A study which concludes that there is little evidence that peer evaluation is a valid or reliable means of evaluation.

Boyd, James, and Schietinger, E. F. *Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Southern Colleges and Universities*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1976. Results of a regional survey of faculty evaluation procedures involving 536 responding institutions which practice some method(s) of faculty evaluation.

Centra, John A., editor. *Renewing and Evaluation Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Dressel, Paul. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976. A basic guide and introduction to evaluation in academic institutions and systems.

Eble, Kenneth E. *The Craft of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976. Suggestions to improve college teaching within the framework of a humanistic approach to the subject, analysis of resistance to improving college teaching, and proposed institutional responses to that resistance.

___. *The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching*. Salt Lake City: Project To Improve College Teaching, 1971. Results of a two-year project that included a comprehensive literature search, visits to campuses, and a conference on evaluation; comprehensive study to 1971.

Faculty Evaluation for Improved Learning. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1977. Report of the initial conclusions of a special task force on faculty evaluation and institutional reward structure.

Farmer, C. H. "Colleague Evaluation: The Silence Is Deafening." *Liberal Education* 62: 432-36; October 1976.

Gardner, Don E. "Five Evaluation Frameworks." *Journal of Higher Education* 48: 571-93; September/October 1977. Five basic frameworks of evaluation are identified and discussed, including for each its basic assumption, special characteristics, advantages and disadvantages, and criteria for selection.

Lewis, Lionel S. *Scaling the Ivory Tower: Merit and Its Limits in Academic Careers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975. Examination of meritocratic evaluation as the most important consideration in institutional decisions about tenure and promotion in colleges and universities. The author considers publication records, letters of recommendation, and other material in stating his position.

Linsky, A. S., and Straus, M. A. "Student Evaluations, Research Productivity, and Eminence of College Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education* 46: 89-102; January/February 1975. Useful study that correlates a variety of measures of research productivity with measures of the quality of teaching.

Meeth, L. Richard. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation." *Report on Teaching*. Vol. 2. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1976. Report on methods in current use to measure teaching evaluation.

Miller, Richard. *Evaluating Faculty Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. A book that provides basic and general information on evaluation of faculty performance and is used widely by administrators, especially at two-year colleges. An annotated bibliography is included.

Popham, W. James. *Educational Evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975. One of only a few single-source, comprehensive presentations on educational evaluation, a practical source book for methods and strategies.

Provus, Malcolm. *Discrepancy Evaluation*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1971. Descriptive study of the Discrepancy Model of educational evaluation, by its designer.

Rose, Clare. "Stalking the Perfect Teacher." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 4, 1976, p. 24. Concise and direct statement calling for the use of multiple factors for evaluating faculty performance and expressing the need for higher education to continue to define direct measures of student learning.

Seldin, Peter. *How Colleges Evaluate Professors*. New York: Blythe-Pennington, 1975. An overview of the evaluation of faculty at four-year institutions.

Shipka, Thomas A. "The Crisis in Peer Review." *NEA Advocate*, April/May 1978, pp. 6-7. An article describing new stresses on evaluation by colleagues.

Stufflebeam, D. L., and others. *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making.* Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1971. Comprehensive treatment of evaluation as a basis for decision making; presentation of the CIPP Model, one of the most widely known decision-facilitation evaluation systems.

Worthen, Baline R., and Sander, James R. *Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice.* Worthington, Ohio.: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973. A collection of essays pertinent to various decision-making models, including a point-by-point comparison of the models.